

the Education and Workforce Committee, for the opportunity to address my safety concerns. This bill will help increase employment opportunities for 17-year-olds, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

H.R. 2327 addresses the ability of licensed 17-year-olds to drive limited amounts on the job. Under current law, minors are permitted to drive on the job within certain limits. However, the Department of Labor has narrowly defined these restrictions to the point that minors would be prohibited from driving on the job under most circumstances. Fines have been levied against automobile dealerships and other businesses for having teens complete such tasks as moving cars after they are washed or returning vehicles from the gasoline station.

The Drive for Teen Employment Act merely established a clear definition for limited driving, while maintaining injury-prevention measures on the job. This bill will allow limited driving by a 17-year-old in low risk and supervised settings and provides numerous safeguards, including: work-related driving is restricted to daylight hours; towing is prohibited; the driver must hold a state driver's license and must have completed a state approved driver education course; the driving is capped at 20 percent of the work week; minors must not have any record of moving violations at the time of hire; driving distance is limited to a 30-mile radius; route deliveries and route sales are prohibited; and urgent, time-sensitive deliveries are prohibited.

By establishing safety precautions and clear guidelines for employers, we can encourage much-needed employment for teenagers, while maintaining safety measures on the job. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I have had a long interest in reforming regulations that do not pass what I call "The Stupid Test." I believe the teen driver regulation is a poster child for failing "The Stupid Test."

In 1993, the Department of Labor made a major regulatory change in the working definition of what incidental and occasional meant for licensed 16 and 17 year olds driving in the workplace. The change limits those under age 18 from driving more than one incident a week. The Department did this with no formal rule making and without informing any small businesses. Businesses first learned of the change when they received fines for non-compliance.

One such incident involved a 17 year-old student working in a high school sponsored co-op program at a local bank in Milan, Illinois. This young lady was in the bookkeeping department and would occasionally make trips to a branch bank four miles away. The bank was fined \$500 because of her occasional driving. Does it make any sense that these teens can drive an unlimited amount when they are not working, but while under supervised protection at work, they are completely prohibited from driving?

In Washington State alone, it is estimated that this regulation resulted in the loss of at least 1,000 job opportunities for teens. The irony is that while the Department of Labor is spending upwards of \$900 million annually on summer jobs programs, their own regulations is restricting the hiring of teens.

My co-authoris GENE GREEN and MARTY MARTINEZ have helped negotiate a good bill that, while not going as far as the bill reported

out of the House Education and Workforce Committee, it at least establishes some reasonable definition for what driving activities 17 year olds can perform. We reluctantly agreed to preclude 16 year olds from the bill after opposition from the Department of Labor.

Under the bill driving is allowed as long as it does not exceed one-third of an employee's worktime in any workday and no more than 20 percent of an employees worktime in any work week. The bill limits the daily delivery of goods to two trips, although under the bill an employers vehicle is not considered a good.

This legislation has been endorsed by the National Small Business United, National Automobile Dealers Association, National Community Pharmacists Association and the National Association of Minority Automobile Dealers.

We simply seek to bring a clearer, more reasonable standard for workers and business and hope you will support passage of H.R. 2327.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2327, the Drive for Teen Employment Act.

Under current law, minors are permitted to drive on the job under occasional and incidental circumstances, and until 1994, automobile dealerships across the country regularly employed minors to wash and detail cars, move cars on the lots, and occasionally drive an automobile to a nearby lot or gas station. These jobs provided employment for thousands of young people.

However, in 1994, the Department of Labor, without any rulemaking, decided to define occasional and incidental so narrowly as to prohibit minors from driving on the job under almost all circumstances. The Department then fined 60 Seattle area auto dealers nearly \$200,000 for alleged child labor law violations and caused nearly 1,000 16 and 17 year olds to become unemployed.

To address this problem, my colleague from Texas, Mr. COMBEST, introduced H.R. 2327. H.R. 2327, as passed by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, included provisions to permit 16 and 17 year olds to drive during daylight hours for no more than one-third of the day and no more than 20 percent of the work week. It also prohibited minors from towing or driving outside of a 50 mile radius from the job site.

Since the bill was reported by the Committee, several of my colleagues and I have worked with Mr. COMBEST to further restrict the provisions of the bill and make it even better. The bill before you today pertains only to 17 year olds, requires that the minor have a clean driving record, and limits driving to a 30-mile radius.

This bill merely removes the concerns small business owners have about hiring teenagers for jobs that require limited driving and establishes clear guidelines to assist the Department in enforcing a regulation under its jurisdiction.

At a time when, according to Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, "despite the strong economy, young people living in high-poverty areas don't have jobs," H.R. 2327 makes good sense.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FAWELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2327, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for a change in the exemption from the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for minors who are 17 years of age and who engage in the operation of automobiles and trucks."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2327 and on H.R. 4257.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4103, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4103), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1998 at page H8657.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4103, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Defense Appropriations bill, which is a very good conference report, and it is a good defense appropriations bill as far as it goes. The

problem is, this bill does not make adequate funds available to meet some of the shortfalls that have been identified by the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Force.

The bill is \$488 million below the President's budget request, but it is only below the President's budget request because the military construction allocation was so low, so critically low that we had to transfer that much of our authority to the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Despite this, in the conference report before the House we added \$202 million over the budget request for a higher pay raise for the troops than was proposed by the President. We increased net funding for the Readiness accounts, Operation and Maintenance, by more than \$500 million over the President's budget, while we cut a lot of unnecessary administrative and headquarters costs. We added \$370 million over the budget request for National Guard and Reserve training and operations.

We provided \$135 million for the Department of Defense-sponsored Peer Review Breast Cancer Research program. The President's budget requested no funds for that program. We also provided \$50 million for the DOD-sponsored Peer Review Prostate Cancer Research program, again funds that were not included in the budget request. We provided \$735 million for Defense counter-drug and drug interdiction programs.

Mr. Speaker, the list of the needs of the Department of Defense and the services is very long, and some of the more obvious are:

FY 1999 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET IS NOT ADEQUATE

Under the President's proposed FY 1999 defense budget, this will be the fourteenth straight year defense spending has fallen, when inflation is taken into account (every year since FY 1985). The cumulative decline since 1985 is nearly 40 percent.

When considered in constant dollars, the President proposed FY 1999 defense budget is the lowest in nearly forty years.

Moreover, the President's proposed plan for defense over the next five years (FY 1999-2003) is more than \$54 billion less than what is needed to keep up with inflation.

FORCE STRUCTURE CUTS/INCREASED DEPLOYMENTS

The size of the active duty military force has been cut by 36 percent (or over 700,000 troops) over the past ten years.

Yet that smaller force is being asked to deploy more and more often.

Army overseas deployment are up 300 percent from the rates sustained during the

Cold War. This year, on average, on any given day one of three Army soldiers is deployed outside of the United States.

The Army had 18 active divisions during Desert Storm. We are down to 10 divisions today.

For the Navy today, on any given day 57 percent of its ships are at sea on deployment. In 1992 the figure was 37 percent.

The number of Air Force personnel deployed away from home today is four times higher than in 1989—yet the Air Force is more than one-third smaller.

Through FY 2003, the President budget plans on cutting a total of 103,000 active duty and reserve military personnel from existing levels (54,000 active duty and 49,000 reserve personnel).

So while their missions are going up, because of budget constraints the military continues to shrink in size.

MANPOWER PROBLEMS

The services are having growing problems retaining personnel. Some examples:

Air Force pilot retention is down significantly. A few years ago the re-enlistment rate was near 75 percent. Today it is at 36 percent, well below the Air Force target of 58 percent.

Both the Navy and the Air Force are well below their targets for re-enlistments of first-term personnel. The Air Force is 18 percent below its re-enlistment goal, the Navy 7 percent. A recent Navy Times survey reveals that that 75 percent of respondents intend to leave the service.

READINESS PROBLEMS

Mission-capable rates for both Air Force and Navy aircraft have dropped every year since 1991. There are increasing shortages of spare parts and cannibalization of existing aircraft is on the rise. Last year Congress had to add over \$600 million for aviation spare parts. CINCPAC has testified that his command's cannibalization rate has doubled since 1996.

Due to funding shortages the Army has cut programmed tank training by over 20 percent in each of the past two years.

FUNDING AND BUDGET PROBLEMS

For FY 1999, the military services and the Guard have provided Congress with specific program shortfalls of \$12 billion that are not funded in the President's budget.

The President's FY 1999 budget proposes cutting the Military Construction budget by over \$1.4 billion from current levels—a 15 percent cut.

The President's FY 1999 budget cuts Army, Marine Corps and Air Force depot maintenance by over \$315 million from current levels. Army depot maintenance is proposed for a one-year reduction of 23 percent, while Marine Corps depot maintenance is cut by 40 percent.

The President's FY 1999 budget cuts real property repair and maintenance by nearly 15 percent, or over \$600 million from this year's levels.

The President's FY 1999 budget proposes cutting Research and Development by nearly \$600 million, or a 2 percent cut.

PERSONNEL AND READINESS-RELATED FUNDING SHORTFALLS

The President's FY 1999 budget does not contain any funding for the Bosnia deployment. This is a shortfall of nearly \$1.9 billion.

The Service Chiefs have identified FY 1999 personnel/readiness shortfalls of nearly \$3.3 billion, including: Personnel: \$250 million short;

O&M: over \$3 billion short, including depot maintenance (\$350 million short), real property maintenance (\$1.3 billion short), spare parts (\$256 million short), active and reserve forces training (\$400 million short), and base operations (\$750 million short).

Army Chief of Staff Reimer told you: "If we can't get these shortfalls fixed, the Army is going under."

WEAPONS MODERNIZATION SHORTFALLS

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have repeatedly identified a need for annual procurement funding of \$60 billion. The FY 1999 budget proposes only \$48 billion. Under the President's budget, the "\$60 billion procurement target" will not be reached for another three years (FY 2001).

For FY 1999, the Service chiefs have identified another \$5 billion in shortfalls relating to procurement and RDTE.

This includes \$1 billion in "non-glamorous" items such as trucks/engineering vehicles (\$230 million short), basic equipment for soldiers (\$245 million) and modifications for aging equipment (\$457 million).

SERVICE-SPECIFIC MODERNIZATION PROBLEMS

Army: The Army's medium truck fleet currently averages over 25 years old. More than one-half of the current inventory qualifies for antique license plates. Under the current budget plan this fleet will not be replaced for another 30 years.

The Army has a requirement for 18,000 additional HMMWV vehicles. The FY 1999 budget proposes buying 9 vehicles.

Navy: The Navy budget proposes construction of only six ships in FY 1999 and is at similar levels for the foreseeable future. This is far below the ten ships per year which are needed to support the current fleet level of 326 ships (which is a far cry from the Reagan-era goal of a "600 ship Navy").

Marine Corps: Commandant of the Marine Corps has said repeatedly: "My annual procurement budget is \$500 million short."

In the FY 1999 budget the Marines are getting \$750 million in procurement. This means the USMC modernization budget is funded at only 60 percent of requirements.

Air Force: For FY 1999 the Air Force is requesting procurement of only two fighter aircraft. If approved by the Congress this would be the lowest in the history of the Air Force.

H.R. 4103 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
MILITARY PERSONNEL						
Military Personnel, Army	20,452,057,000	21,002,051,000	20,908,851,000	20,822,051,000	20,841,687,000	+389,630,000
Military Personnel, Navy	16,493,518,000	16,613,053,000	16,560,253,000	16,532,153,000	16,570,754,000	+77,236,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	6,137,898,000	6,272,089,000	6,241,189,000	6,253,189,000	6,263,387,000	+125,488,000
Military Personnel, Air Force	17,102,120,000	17,311,683,000	17,201,583,000	17,205,660,000	17,211,987,000	+109,867,000
Reserve Personnel, Army	2,032,046,000	2,152,075,000	2,171,875,000	2,152,075,000	2,167,052,000	+135,006,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,376,801,000	1,387,379,000	1,427,979,000	1,387,379,000	1,426,663,000	+50,062,000
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	391,770,000	401,888,000	403,513,000	401,888,000	406,616,000	+14,846,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	815,915,000	856,176,000	850,576,000	856,176,000	852,324,000	+36,409,000
National Guard Personnel, Army	3,333,867,000	3,404,595,000	3,413,195,000	3,499,595,000	3,489,987,000	+156,120,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,334,712,000	1,376,097,000	1,372,997,000	1,376,097,000	1,377,109,000	+42,397,000
Total, title I, Military Personnel	69,470,505,000	70,777,086,000	70,551,811,000	70,486,263,000	70,807,566,000	+1,137,061,000
TITLE II						
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
Operation and Maintenance, Army	16,754,306,000	17,223,063,000	16,936,503,000	17,212,463,000	17,185,623,000	+431,317,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
(By transfer - Quality of Life Enhancements)	(-130,000,000)
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-96,000,000)	(-96,000,000)	(-96,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	21,617,766,000	21,877,202,000	21,638,999,000	21,813,315,000	21,872,389,000	+254,633,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
(By transfer - Quality of Life Enhancements)	(-48,000,000)
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-32,087,000)	(-32,087,000)	(-32,087,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,372,535,000	2,523,703,000	2,585,118,000	2,576,190,000	2,578,718,000	+206,083,000
(By transfer - Quality of Life Enhancements)	(-36,000,000)
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-9,513,000)	(-9,513,000)	(-9,513,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	18,492,883,000	19,127,004,000	19,024,233,000	19,064,841,000	19,021,045,000	+528,162,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
(By transfer - Quality of Life Enhancements)	(-50,000,000)
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-52,200,000)	(-52,200,000)	(-52,200,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	10,369,740,000	10,750,601,000	10,804,542,000	10,259,231,000	10,914,076,000	+544,336,000
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-90,020,000)	(-90,020,000)	(-90,020,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,207,891,000	1,202,622,000	1,201,222,000	1,202,622,000	1,202,622,000	-5,269,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	921,711,000	928,639,000	949,039,000	928,639,000	957,239,000	+35,528,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	116,366,000	114,593,000	119,093,000	114,593,000	117,883,000	+1,527,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,632,030,000	1,744,696,000	1,735,996,000	1,744,696,000	1,747,696,000	+115,666,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,419,632,000	2,436,815,000	2,570,315,000	2,661,815,000	2,678,015,000	+258,383,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,013,282,000	3,093,933,000	3,075,233,000	3,113,933,000	3,106,933,000	+93,651,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	1,884,000,000	746,900,000	746,900,000	746,900,000	439,400,000	-1,444,600,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,952,000	7,324,000	7,324,000	7,324,000	7,324,000	+372,000
Environmental Restoration, Army	375,337,000	377,640,000	342,640,000	370,640,000	370,640,000	-4,697,000
Environmental Restoration, Navy	275,500,000	281,600,000	281,600,000	274,600,000	274,600,000	-900,000
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,900,000	379,100,000	379,100,000	372,100,000	372,100,000	-4,800,000
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	26,900,000	26,091,000	26,091,000	23,091,000	26,091,000	-809,000
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	242,300,000	195,000,000	195,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	-17,300,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	47,130,000	63,311,000	56,111,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+2,870,000
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	382,200,000	442,400,000	417,400,000	440,400,000	440,400,000	+58,200,000
Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund	279,820,000
(By transfer)	(279,820,000)	(+279,820,000)
Contingency operations MWR fund	50,000,000
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense	360,000,000	850,000,000	455,000,000	+95,000,000
(By transfer)	(264,000,000)
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance	82,895,461,000	83,542,237,000	83,942,458,000	83,532,313,000	84,042,814,000	+1,147,353,000
(By transfer)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-129,820,000)	(150,000,000)
TITLE III						
PROCUREMENT						
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,346,317,000	1,325,943,000	1,400,338,000	1,408,652,000	1,388,268,000	+41,951,000
Missile Procurement, Army	762,409,000	1,205,788,000	1,140,623,000	1,186,739,000	1,226,335,000	+463,926,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,298,707,000	1,433,608,000	1,513,540,000	1,484,055,000	1,548,340,000	+249,633,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,037,202,000	1,008,855,000	1,099,155,000	998,655,000	1,065,955,000	+28,753,000
Other Procurement, Army	2,679,130,000	3,198,811,000	3,101,130,000	3,395,729,000	3,339,486,000	+660,356,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	6,535,444,000	7,466,734,000	7,599,968,000	7,473,403,000	7,541,709,000	+1,006,265,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,102,193,000	1,327,545,000	1,191,219,000	1,324,045,000	1,211,419,000	+109,226,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	397,547,000	429,539,000	473,803,000	488,939,000	484,203,000	+86,656,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	8,235,591,000	6,252,672,000	5,973,452,000	6,067,272,000	6,035,752,000	-2,199,839,000
Other Procurement, Navy	3,144,205,000	3,937,737,000	3,980,553,000	3,886,475,000	4,072,662,000	+928,457,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	482,398,000	745,858,000	812,618,000	954,177,000	874,216,000	+391,818,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	6,480,983,000	7,756,475,000	8,384,735,000	7,967,023,000	8,095,507,000	+1,614,524,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,394,202,000	2,359,803,000	2,191,527,000	2,219,299,000	2,069,827,000	-324,375,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	398,534,000	384,161,000	388,925,000	384,161,000	379,425,000	-19,109,000
Other Procurement, Air Force	6,592,909,000	6,974,387,000	7,034,217,000	6,904,164,000	6,960,483,000	+367,574,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide	2,106,444,000	2,041,850,000	2,055,432,000	1,932,250,000	1,944,833,000	-161,611,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	653,000,000	120,000,000	500,000,000	352,000,000	-301,000,000
Total, title III, Procurement	45,647,215,000	47,849,546,000	48,471,235,000	48,577,038,000	48,580,420,000	+2,943,205,000

H.R. 4103 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 — continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE IV						
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	5,156,507,000	4,780,545,000	4,967,446,000	4,891,640,000	5,031,788,000	-124,719,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	8,115,686,000	8,108,923,000	8,297,986,000	8,215,519,000	8,636,649,000	+520,963,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	14,507,804,000	13,568,093,000	13,577,441,000	13,693,153,000	13,758,811,000	-746,993,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	9,821,760,000	9,314,665,000	8,776,318,000	9,032,908,000	9,036,551,000	-785,208,000
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense	258,183,000	251,106,000	263,606,000	249,106,000	258,606,000	+423,000
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	31,384,000	25,245,000	35,245,000	25,245,000	34,245,000	+2,861,000
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation..	37,891,324,000	36,078,577,000	35,918,042,000	36,107,571,000	36,756,650,000	-1,134,674,000
TITLE V						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS						
Defense Working Capital Funds	971,952,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	94,500,000	-877,452,000
Transfer stockpile balances to working capital fund		(350,000,000)	(350,000,000)			
Reserve mobilization income insurance fund.....		37,000,000				
National Defense Sealift Fund:						
Ready Reserve Force	302,000,000	311,266,000	311,266,000	335,000,000	311,266,000	+9,266,000
Acquisition.....	772,948,000	106,900,000	362,100,000	334,566,000	397,100,000	-375,848,000
(Transfer out)			(-28,800,000)		(-28,800,000)	(-28,800,000)
Total	1,074,948,000	418,166,000	673,366,000	669,566,000	708,366,000	-366,582,000
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds	2,046,900,000	549,666,000	767,666,000	764,066,000	802,866,000	-1,244,034,000
(By transfer)		(350,000,000)	(350,000,000)			
TITLE VI						
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance	10,095,007,000	9,653,435,000	9,725,235,000	9,684,935,000	9,727,985,000	-367,022,000
Procurement.....	274,068,000	402,387,000	402,387,000	402,387,000	402,387,000	+128,319,000
Research and development				250,000,000	19,500,000	+19,500,000
Total, Defense Health Program	10,369,075,000	10,055,822,000	10,127,622,000	10,337,322,000	10,149,872,000	-219,203,000
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Army: 1/						
Operation and maintenance	462,200,000	531,650,000	508,650,000	491,700,000	491,700,000	+29,500,000
Procurement.....	72,200,000	140,670,000	124,670,000	115,670,000	115,670,000	+43,470,000
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	66,300,000	162,780,000	162,780,000	172,780,000	172,780,000	+106,480,000
Total, Chemical Agents	600,700,000	855,100,000	796,100,000	780,150,000	780,150,000	+179,450,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense.....	712,882,000	727,582,000	764,595,000	742,582,000	735,582,000	+22,700,000
Office of the Inspector General	138,380,000	132,064,000	132,064,000	132,064,000	132,064,000	-6,316,000
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	11,821,037,000	11,770,568,000	11,820,381,000	11,992,118,000	11,797,668,000	-23,369,000
TITLE VII						
RELATED AGENCIES						
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	196,900,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	+4,600,000
Intelligence Community Management Account	121,080,000	138,623,000	136,123,000	134,623,000	129,123,000	+8,043,000
Transfer to Dept of Justice	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)	
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	35,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-10,000,000
National Security Education Trust Fund	2,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, title VII, Related agencies	354,980,000	360,123,000	355,623,000	364,123,000	358,623,000	+3,643,000
TITLE VIII						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Additional transfer authority (sec. 8005)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(1,775,000,000)	(1,650,000,000)	(-125,000,000)
Indian Financing Act incentives (sec. 8024)	8,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (sec. 8040)	64,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000		25,000,000	-39,000,000
Overseas Military Fac Investment Recovery (sec. 8044)	30,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	+8,000,000
Export loan guarantee PGM (sec. 8075)	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Rescissions (sec. 8058)	-176,100,000		-268,370,000	-69,800,000	-415,908,688	-239,808,688
Flying Hour/readiness offset	-1,253,000,000					+1,253,000,000
FFRDC's/consultants (sec. 8034)	-71,800,000		-62,000,000		-62,000,000	+9,800,000
Advisory and assistance services	-300,000,000					+300,000,000
RDT&E, Def-Wide dual-use program	2,000,000					-2,000,000
Fisher Houses (sec. 8069)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Travel Cards (sec. 8060)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Warranties.....	-75,000,000					+75,000,000
Excess inventory.....	-100,000,000					+100,000,000
National Missile Defense Offset	-474,000,000					+474,000,000
Intrepid.....	13,000,000					-13,000,000

H.R. 4103 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 — continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Expiring Balances	-100,000,000					+ 100,000,000
National Security Strategy Study Group	3,000,000					-3,000,000
Lexington Bluegrass	4,000,000					-4,000,000
Defense reform initiative (DRI) Title II savings (sec. 8105)				-150,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000
Ship Transfers (sec. 8110)			-638,850,000	-637,000,000	-636,850,000	-636,850,000
National Defense stockpile transaction fund asset sale credit (sec. 8109)				-100,000,000	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Inflation Savings (sec. 8108)			-204,100,000	-400,800,000	-400,800,000	-400,800,000
Procurement Reductions (sec. 8134)					-142,100,000	-142,100,000
Foreign Currency Fluctuations (sec. 8135)					-193,800,000	-193,800,000
Fuel Repricing (sec. 8136)					-502,000,000	-502,000,000
Total, title VIII	-2,418,900,000	71,000,000	-1,100,320,000	-1,305,400,000	-2,446,058,688	-27,158,688
EMERGENCY FUNDING						
Boenia (Emergency Funding)		1,858,600,000		1,858,600,000		
Supplemental (P.L. 105-174) (emergency funding)	2,834,775,000					-2,834,775,000
Total, Emergency funding	2,834,775,000	1,858,600,000		1,858,600,000		-2,834,775,000
BUDGET SCOREKEEPING ADJUSTMENTS						
Adjustment for unapprop'd balance transfer (Stockpile)	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	
Stockpile collections (unappropriated)	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	
Emergency funding	-2,834,775,000	-1,858,600,000		-1,858,600,000		+ 2,834,775,000
Total adjustments	-2,834,775,000	-1,858,600,000		-1,858,600,000		+ 2,834,775,000
Total, Department of Defense	247,708,522,000	250,998,803,000	250,727,097,000	250,518,092,000	250,510,548,312	+ 2,802,026,312
RECAPITULATION						
Title I - Military Personnel	69,470,505,000	70,777,086,000	70,551,811,000	70,486,263,000	70,607,566,000	+ 1,137,061,000
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	82,895,461,000	83,542,237,000	83,942,459,000	83,532,313,000	84,042,814,000	+ 1,147,353,000
(By transfer)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-129,820,000)	(150,000,000)	
Title III - Procurement	45,847,215,000	47,849,546,000	48,471,235,000	48,577,038,000	48,590,420,000	+ 2,943,205,000
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	37,891,324,000	36,078,577,000	35,918,042,000	36,107,571,000	36,756,650,000	-1,134,674,000
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,046,900,000	549,666,000	767,866,000	764,066,000	802,866,000	-1,244,034,000
(By transfer)		(350,000,000)	(350,000,000)			
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	11,821,037,000	11,770,568,000	11,820,381,000	11,992,118,000	11,797,668,000	-23,369,000
Title VII - Related agencies	354,980,000	380,123,000	355,623,000	364,123,000	358,623,000	+ 3,643,000
Title VIII - General provisions	-2,418,900,000	71,000,000	-1,100,320,000	-1,305,400,000	-2,446,058,688	-27,158,688
Emergency funding	2,834,775,000	1,858,600,000		1,858,600,000		-2,834,775,000
Budget adjustments	-2,834,775,000	-1,858,600,000		-1,858,600,000		+ 2,834,775,000
Total, Department of Defense	247,708,522,000	250,998,803,000	250,727,097,000	250,518,092,000	250,510,548,312	+ 2,802,026,312
Allocation recap (sec. 302b):						
Mandatory	196,900,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	201,500,000	+ 4,600,000
Discretionary:						
Non-defense	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	
Defense	247,484,622,000	250,770,303,000	250,498,597,000	250,289,592,000	250,282,048,312	+ 2,797,426,312
Total discretionary	247,511,622,000	250,797,303,000	250,525,597,000	250,316,592,000	250,309,048,312	+ 2,797,426,312
Grand total	247,708,522,000	250,998,803,000	250,727,097,000	250,518,092,000	250,510,548,312	+ 2,802,026,312

1/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me say, I was in a markup in another committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) on a colloquy regarding two important Department of Defense health care initiatives, AIMCARE and the Composite Health Care System II.

Mr. Chairman, DOD has competitively selected Anesthesia Information Management System, AIMCARE, that automates the collection of operating room data and clinical processes. This system offers DOD significant cost savings of over 70 percent with "Enterprise" implementation rather than "hospital by hospital" implementation. This 70 percent savings represents savings of over \$10 million, that is being made available in the first quarter of fiscal year 1999.

Am I correct in my understanding that, resources permitting, the Department is interested in taking advantage of this opportunity?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would respond that the gentleman is absolutely correct in his understanding.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. With regard to the CHCSII, I have raised concerns with the chairman that, although I support the conference report which authorizes DOD to do field testing of this system at Tripler Army Medical Center in Honolulu, Hawaii, I hope to receive an assurance that since current software development and integration is taking place in the national capital region, that these activities will be maintained in the national capital region.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the gentleman from Virginia that it is the intent of the conferees to maintain software integration and development for the CHCSII system in the national capital region.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his hard work on this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman and I this year have visited a number of installations throughout the country. We found shortages over the last 2 or 3 years, and the list that the chairman put in the RECORD, I hope Members will pay attention to.

Readiness has slipped substantially. Some of our units are deployed that

are not C-1, and that is a dangerous situation. As a matter of fact, we feel there are shortages which really hurt our national security. Without the supplemental, this bill will not be adequate. It is absolutely essential that we pass a supplemental, not offset, and I look forward to working with the chairman, and I am hoping we can get an adequate amount of money for Y2K, for computer security, for Bosnia, and for O&M in the supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for the great job and the support that he has given us as we prepared this bill in the subcommittee and in the full committee and on the floor of the House, and then through the conference with the other body.

Also, I would like to mention our counterparts in the Senate, Senator TED STEVENS and Senator DAN INOUE, as we worked closely with them for weeks leading up to our final conference. We found them to be very cooperative, very constructive, and certainly committed to the security of our Nation.

Each and every member of our subcommittee has a vast amount of knowledge about our National Security that they bring to the table. In addition to JACK on that side of the aisle, NORM DICKS, MARTY SABO, JULIAN DIXON, and PETE VISCLOSKEY all have made valuable contributions throughout the years they have served on this subcommittee. On our side of the aisle we have JERRY LEWIS, JOE SKEEN, DAVE HOBSON, HENRY BONILLA, GEORGE NETHERCUTT, ERNEST ISTOOK, and DUKE CUNNINGHAM. All of them devote a tremendous amount of time and energy helping us craft this bill.

In addition we are fortunate to have Chairman BOB LIVINGSTON, and Ranking Minority Member DAVE OBEY serving on this subcommittee. They provide valuable leadership during the particularly tough times as we bring this bill through the process.

There are two other members that I have saved for last. They are JOE MCDADE and BILL HEFNER who are both retiring this year, JOE, BILL, and I all joined this subcommittee together 18 years ago and this will be the last time that it will be my privilege to bring a bill to the floor with them.

JOE MCDADE has dedicated his entire life to this institution. No constituency in the Nation, is better represented than the people of the 10th district of Pennsylvania. Anywhere you go in his district you will come across some project that would not be there if it weren't for JOE. He is a great Congressman, and a loving husband and father. I will miss him, but as one who also has a young son I know he will be very happy with the time he will now have to do the things we all would like to do with our growing boys. JOE, thank you for being my friend.

BILL HEFNER is one of the most unique members in the Congress. Behind that self-deprecating personality and slow Southern drawl is a very intelligent Congressman who has

used his considerable legislative talent to make the quality of life much better for millions of service members and their families. I have had the privilege of traveling with BILL and his wife Nancy to some of the hot spots in the world. He is a true patriot and great member of this body. BILL we will all miss you.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call special attention to the staff of our subcommittee. I am providing all of the names of all of our staffers for the record, including the associate staff members of our committee members, because they have all contributed just tremendously to the work of our subcommittee.

I do want to specifically mention the chief of staff and the clerk of the subcommittee, Kevin Roper, who has spent many, many long hours, many, many days, many weeks, many months, getting us to where we are today. I would say that Kevin has a brain somewhat like a computer. One can punch up almost any subject and he can bring it up, and if one checks it out one will find that it is very accurate.

Also, Greg Dahlberg, who represents the minority on the subcommittee, and who is equally aggressive in meeting the responsibilities of the subcommittee. I take my hat off and salute both of them and the staffs who worked with them.

JACK and I are very fortunate to have a professional staff which is beyond a doubt the best on the hill. They also work many long hours and have become true professionals in their areas of expertise. They are Doug Gregory, Alicia Jones, Dave Kilian, Betsy Phillips, Julie Pacquing, Greg Walters, Trish Ryan, Tina Jonas, Paul Juola, Steve Nixon, Dave Norquist, Jenny Mummert, and Sherry Young. Julie Pacquing is retiring this year after many years of service to the Appropriations Committee. She has played a very valuable role particularly in the Intelligence part of our lives that we can't talk about and she will be missed by all of us. I also want to note that Trish Ryan and her husband Terry, and Steve Nixon and his wife Nancy are about to become parents for the first time. We are all one big happy family on this subcommittee and we all look forward to the births of Trish and Steve's children.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the staff members of the full committee who hardly ever get any recognition, but play very important roles in putting all of our products together. They are ably led by Jim Dyer our Staff Director. We also appreciate the good work of Dennis Kedzior, John Mikel, Chuck Parkinson, Elizabeth Morra, Di Kane, Tracey La Turner, Sandy Farrow, Theodore Powell, and Larry Boorman. At the Computer Shop we also want to thank Ken Marx and Dale Oak. For this conference alone we had 12 computer runs. In case you are interested there are 2,686 separate line items that we track in this bill, 947 of which were in conference.

Each member of our committee also has staff who play an important role. At the risk of leaving someone out, let me thank them for all of their work throughout the year. They are Jake O'Donnell, Letitia White, Bruce Donisthorpe, Kenny Kraft, Marc Lubin, Rob Neal, Nancy Nowak, Bill Berl, Les Dixon, Steve McBee, Irene Schecter, Dan Beck, Alan

Dillingham, Paul Cunningham, and John McNutt. In particular, I want to thank Paul Cambon and Carman Scialabba who work for BOB LIVINGSTON and JACK MURTHA.

And finally, I want to thank a couple of people who serve on my personal staff and JACK's who help us in too many ways to mention here. They are my Administrative Assistant Harry Glenn and Jane Porter of my office. In JACK's office I want to thank Colette Marchesini-Pollock.

As I said in the beginning, this is a very involved process, creating a conference agreement appropriating \$250 billion. There are a lot of very capable members and staff who work many many long hours throughout the year to produce this product, but particularly at this time of the year. I thank each and every one of you, and I also thank your families who lend you to us, particularly mine. We know that this work is tough on our families and we appreciate your understanding. We know that there are some back to school nights that don't get attended, and some high school football games and half time shows that are missed. We know there are birthday parties that get postponed, as well as baby showers. But please know that this Congressman, and this Congress appreciate your unselfish contribution to the National Security of this great Nation.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not mention the staff of the subcommittee in the Senate, headed by Steve Cortese, because they have also been extremely cooperative and extremely constructive in the effort that we have put forth.

On the Senate side, Steve Cortese and Charlie Houy, as Majority and Minority Staff Directors, work together and with our staff in a very accommodating manner. They have assembled a very talented group of professional staffers, and let me thank each of them here for their work on behalf of the Conference: Mary Marshall, John Young, Sid Ashworth, Susan Hogan, Gary Reese, Tom Hamkins, Carolyn Willis, and Mazie Mattson. They also rely on help from the Full Committee including Jay Kimmitt, Dona Pate, and Justin Weddle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of the Fiscal Year 1999 Department of Defense Conference Report.

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. MURTHA deserve credit for putting together an outstanding conference report. In my four years on the National Security Subcommittee, this bill was certainly the most difficult to reach agreement on, because of the very tight constraints imposed by the Balanced Budget Agreement. I think all of the members of the Subcommittee would agree that our allocation this year was far below what is needed to meet the needs of the Department of Defense. Despite these pressures, our Subcommittee staff once again worked long hours to put together a very balanced package that addresses the immediate needs of the Defense Department.

I commend the efforts of the Chairman and Ranking Member on behalf of the health research programs contained within this bill. The Department of Defense oversees some of the most productive health research efforts sponsored by the federal government, with very real quality of life benefits for our men and women in uniform. We were not able to do all

that we would have liked for health research, but I believe this conference package addresses some of the most urgent research needs of the Department of Defense. I am particularly supportive of the funding this bill provides for diabetes research. In Fiscal Year 1998, we were able to provide \$4 million to initiate a diabetes detection, prevention and care program for the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, utilizing the technology and methods of the Joslin Diabetes Center. While I wish we had been able to maintain the House funded level of \$6.4 million for this program in this bill, the \$4.5 million the conference agreement provides will allow continuation of the Diabetes Pilot Program, [Program Element #630002, Project #9411]. I anticipate significant findings from this promising project, which will benefit soldiers and their families alike.

I hope that Fiscal Year 1999 marks the low point for defense spending. We continue to face shortfalls in all accounts and urgently need to correct the downward trend for defense spending. But within the constraints imposed by the Balanced Budget agreement, this is an excellent bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 4103, the Conference Report on Defense Appropriations. I want to recognize the hard work of our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He, along with the other conferees and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee staff, faced many difficult choices in putting together this bill, and I commend them for all their hard work.

As many people are learning, the Department of Defense is facing less funding for the fourteenth straight year. Our armed forces are forced to do more with less. The conferees face difficult decisions in determining how much to provide for troop support, operations and maintenance, procurement of new and existing vehicles and weapon systems, and investing in future technology and weapons development.

I think this bill strikes an important balance. It provides a pay increase of 3.6 percent for military personnel. It provides an extra \$500 million over the President's request for Operations and Maintenance, the so-called "readiness accounts." The frequent overseas deployments of our troops are siphoning funds from these accounts, and the House Members recognize the importance of replenishing funds for training and maintenance.

Most importantly, this conference report reflects the importance of continuing to develop new technologies and weapons systems. As we try to prepare and equip our troops for the battlefields of the future, countless engineers are working in government laboratories and research facilities to develop the weapons, the ammunition, the vehicles and the technology our armed forces need to defend the United States. The military's research and development is critical to keeping our men and women in uniform safe and well-equipped wherever they serve, whether home or abroad.

This bill allows for these important efforts to continue and expand. I thank the conferees for providing an additional \$4 million for the Crusader Advanced Field Artillery System, which is being developed by the men and women at Picatinny Arsenal in my district. As I have said before, this critical program is a key element

of the Army's long-term plans, and is faster and more lethal than the Paladin tank, which is currently in use.

Mr. Speaker, every day our men and women in uniform put their lives on the line to defend us. They deserve to have the tools they need to protect us, and should be compensated for their work. We cannot forget our debt to them, and we must work to provide them with the support they need to do their jobs. We owe them nothing less.

Today we vote to provide funds, support our soldiers and all those who prepare and equip them. An affirmative vote assures that this critical work continues.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express serious reservations about the defense appropriations conference report. I do not dispute the funding decisions made by the conferees. In the main, Chairman YOUNG and Mr. MURTHA have brought back to the House a bill that addresses the pressing defense needs of the Nation in a manner as consistent with the authorization bill as they possibly could have.

As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, however, I am concerned about several authorization provisions in this bill.

Buried in this legislation are six real property matters that should be addressed in the defense authorization process. Section 8132 would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey excess relocatable housing units at Malmstrom Air Force Base. Section 8139 mandates the Secretary of the Air Force to convey certain property in the State of New Hampshire. Section 8140 would permit the Secretary of the Navy to engage in a lease of property to the University of Central Florida. Section 8141 would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to lease certain property from the City of Phoenix near Luke Air Force Base. Section 8143 would provide the authority to the Secretary of the Navy to convey property with consideration to the City of Seattle and, finally, section 8144 would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an Army Reserve Center to the City of Reading, Pennsylvania.

None of these real estate matters, all properly within the jurisdiction of the authorization committee, were raised with the committee during consideration of the defense authorization bill nor were they raised with conferees during negotiations with the Senate on H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. None of these provisions were in the House-passed version of the defense appropriations bill. Most of these provisions came to conference as amendments to the Senate version of H.R. 4103 while the bill was being considered on the floor in the other body. Some of the provisions have murky origins in the conference itself.

None of the offending provisions, to the best of my understanding, address an urgent need that cannot wait for the next authorization cycle. These provisions may have merit, but none have been reviewed adequately. To his credit, Chairman YOUNG fought to keep these provisions—and more—out of this bill. Regrettably, he was not completely successful. As a chairman, I understand what it takes to get out of conference. Compromise with the other body is a necessary component of any conference, but we should refrain from needlessly blurring the line between the authorization and appropriations process.

Beyond the real estate issues contained in this bill, I am deeply concerned about two

other provisions in the area of base closure and realignment.

Section 8142, which would give the Secretary of the Army the authority to retain military family housing at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, in support of the relocation of U.S. Army South, is a direct contravention of a decision made in the 1995 BRAC round to dispose of those units.

Many in this House have criticized the President for his circumvention of the BRAC process for political reasons at McClellan Air Force Base and Kelly Air Force Base. While section 8142 is intended to help the Army and is not purely political, its effect is the same. We should not begin to engage in a case-by-case undoing of prior BRAC decisions for any reason in the absence of an authorized realignment process. I hope we are not opening Pandora's box should this legislation receive the approval of the House today.

Finally, I question the wisdom of requiring the Secretary of the Air Force to expend \$7.6 million from the base closure and realignment accounts for demolition and other base conversion activities at Norton Air Force Base. The expenditures required by section 8145 are not related to any military mission and they are not required to comply with routine environmental remediation requirements. It is extremely unwise to tap the BRAC accounts to subsidize local reuse efforts. In that context, I find it equally unwise to continue the practice of permitting the use of other DOD resources for conversion activities at other BRAC locations.

For these reasons, and despite the fact that this is otherwise a very good bill, I regret that I must vote "no."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the conference report to H.R. 4103, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security for his role in crafting a conference report that truly reflects our nation's priorities and ensures the continued preeminence of our military. He is to be commended for acknowledging the effect quality of life issues has on our military's performance.

I am especially pleased with the provisions that express our concern for the welfare of the men and women in the armed services and their families. H.R. 4103 includes \$35 million for Impact Aid, a program which provides funds to schools that experience a reduced property tax base as a result of their location near a military installation. Military personnel should not be forced to choose between their career and their children's education. This conference report also includes a much needed 3.6 percent military pay raise, a half percent above what was requested. Mr. Chairman, quality of life issues in our military have been neglected for too long. It is time that we address them and I believe that this conference report begins to do that. I urge my colleagues to give this conference report their strongest support.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment and passage of this conference report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4060, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4060), making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, September 25, 1998, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1998, at page H8842).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCDADE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to present today the energy and water bill to the Members of the House and to strongly urge and recommend that it be passed. It was perhaps the most difficult energy and water bill that we have ever had, principally because the budget that was submitted to us was inadequate from the beginning.

In terms of real dollars, it is the lowest budget ever presented for construction programs of the Corps of Engineers.

□ 1545

Obviously, that required us to do a great deal of putting and taking to try to put together a bill that would develop the infrastructure of this country, protect health and safety, and keep our economy going by keeping our ports open and efficient.

Given that background, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have been extraordinarily privileged, as the chairman of this subcommittee, to have an extraordinary group of people to work with.

Jim Ogsbury has been my chief of staff, and one would not find a more faithful and bright person; Jeanne Wilson is an absolute encyclopedia and an intellectual dynamo; Don McKinnon is a gentleman that I have known for some time, and he has been extraordinarily helpful; Bruce Heide handled the entire Corps of Engineers budget, and obviously, from what I have said, he did a superb job.

My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), is not currently on the floor because of other business, but I want to offer him a tribute, as well, because without his cooperation and assistance the bill would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is a \$20.9 billion bill, in gross terms. About \$4 billion goes to the Corps of Engineers to promote public health and safety, et cetera. About \$823 million goes to the Bureau of Reclamation for water projects in the west. Although there is a cut in the Bureau's budget, Mr. Speaker, we fully fund operation and maintenance of Bureau projects, to make sure that those projects are run efficiently and serve the public.

\$16.4 billion is appropriated to the Department of Energy. About \$12 billion is provided for defense activities and \$4 billion is for nondefense activities. As Members of the House know, defense activities include the maintenance of the nuclear stockpile, using science-based intelligence in lieu of nuclear weapons testing, which has been forewarned by this country. The Department has an awesome responsibility, and every year must certify to the President that the stockpile is indeed efficient and reliable.

On the nondefense side of bill, there is a host of energy supply activities, scientific research, et cetera, all of which are very interesting and important. The genome mapping project, the nuclear physics program, the high energy physics program, and other related programs are also funded in this bill.

Finally, there is \$126 million in for independent agencies, such as the Appalachian Regional Commission, which has been diligently serving the people of this Nation for approximately 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to file a more lengthy statement with my remarks for the benefit of Members, or anyone else, who might want to take a look.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 4060, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999. Total spending in this \$21 billion measure is \$388 million below the Administration's request for energy and water programs. The bill is within its 302(b) allocation for both outlays and budget authority.